



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,755	02/19/2002	Baskaran Dharmarajan	MSI-1055US	9369
22801	7590	01/24/2007	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			TRAN, TONGOC	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2134		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/24/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 01/24/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,755	DHARMARAJAN, BASKARAN
	Examiner Tongoc Tran	Art Unit 2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



KAMBIZ ZAND
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 11/8/2006.

Claims 1, 12 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant argues that the combination of the cited art, Brown and Kurowski, fails to disclose "in an event that the session is no longer authenticated, persisting as a pending request at the server, the request from the client and in an event that the session is subsequently re-authenticated, the server processing the pending request". Applicant contends that Kurowski teaches that the data cannot be sent from the client to the server because a network connection is down. However, Kurowski teaches a persistent mechanism is either provided to a local disk or to a server [0208] and storing any commands for the task server in a persistent queue if the network connection is down [0241]. The purpose of the persistent queue is to save the work so it can be processed by the server in the later time after the connection is reestablished.

In response to Applicant's argument to claim 4, Applicant argues that the Office does not make any suggestion that Polizzi adds anything to the teaching of Brown and Kurowski in reference to claim 2. In the cited reference of Polizzi, mentioned three types of authentication, HTTP authentication, form based authentication and cookie based authentication [Polizzi, [0074]]. Brown, However, only talks about the HTTP authentication (prompting user for password through the browser [Brown, 0021]). Therefore, substituting one for the other would have been obvious since cookie

contains information about the user's login parameters insuring that the user and only the user see the content on that website while the user is in session [0075].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The amended limitation, "subsequent to establishing the authenticated session, receiving at the server, **a request** from the client; subsequent to receiving at the server, **a request** from the client, determining whether the session is still authenticated...". The amended claim recites a first "a request" (on line 11) and the second "a request" (on line 12) submitted to the server. It is unclear to the Examiner whether the second request is referring to the previously recited request or it is referring to a second request being submitted from the client. For the purpose of examination and based on the remark on page 17, first paragraph, Examiner interprets the claimed limitation on lines 11 to 12 to mean "subsequent to establishing the authenticated session, receiving at the server a request from the client; subsequent to receiving the request at the server, determining whether the session is still authenticated...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, and 5-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (U.S. Patent Application Application (U.S. 2003/0061288 A1, hereinafter Brown) in view of Kurowski et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0019844, hereinafter Kurowski)

In respect to claim 1, Brown discloses a method comprising:

Establishing an authenticated session between a server and a client; subsequent to establishing the authenticated session, receiving at the server, a request from the client; subsequent to receiving at the server, a request from the client, determining whether the session is still authenticated (see Brown Fig. 4, and page 3, [0028] – [0030], ““a query is made whether user is authenticated. If not, a directive ...is sent back to the client”; “when the user is authenticated, a query is made as to whether the session is ended...if the session is still not ended, a server for the WAG transcoder farm queries user database for accessibility transforms to be applied for the requested device...”). Brown discloses directing the client to be authenticated in the event the client is not authenticated, but does not explicitly disclose persisting the client request as a pending request at the server. However, Kurowski discloses a persistent queue management subsystem is used for storing request from a client for the server when network is down (see Kurowski, [0208], “for some of the operations, the domain objects might depend on other subsystem that provide a persistence mechanism either to the local disk or to a server”, [0241], “storing any command for task server in a persistent queue when the connection is down”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the persistent queue provided at the server and saving work to store in a persistent queue for the task server to process at a later time when connection is down taught by Kurowski with the teaching of verifying if the client is authenticated before processing the request taught by Brown for the benefit of saving the work for the task server to be processed when connection is reestablished (see Kurowski, [0241]).

In respect to claim 2, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the determining comprises verifying an authentication token associated with the client (see Brown, page 2, [0021]).

In respect to claim 3, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 2 wherein the verifying comprises verifying that the authentication token has not timed out (see Brown, page 2, [0030]).

In respect to claim 5, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 2 wherein the authentication token is part of the request received from the client (see Brown, page 2 [0021]).

In respect to claim 6, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 2 wherein the authentication token is encrypted (see Brown, page 1, [0010]).

In respect to claim 7, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 1 wherein persisting the request comprises storing the request in a file (see Kurowski, page 18, [0241]).

In respect to claim 8, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 1 wherein persisting the request comprises storing the request in a database (see Kurowski, page 18, [0241]).

In respect to claim 9, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 1 further comprising directing the client to authenticate the session (see Brown 3, [0029]).

In respect to claim 10, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 9 wherein directing the client to authenticate the session comprises:

Directing the client to a login module; and directing the an address (see Brown, page 3, [0029]).

In respect to claim 11, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 10 wherein the address associated with the pending request is a URL (see Kurowski, page 18, [0241]).

In respect to claim 12, 13, 18, 22, 23, and 25-27, the claimed limitation are similar to claim 1. Therefore, claims 12, 13, 18, 22, 23 and 25-27 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 14, Brown and Kurowski disclose the system of claim 13 further comprising an authentication redirect generator configured to generate an instruction to redirect the client to obtain re-authorization (see Brown, page 18 [0029-0030], "A query...is made as to whether the user is authenticated. If not, a directive...is sent back to client device 10, typically in the form of a web page, requesting content for the user to log onto and/or register with the WAG services offered through proxy machine").

In respect to claims 15-17, claimed limitations are similar to claims 2, 11 and 13. Therefore, claims 15-17 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 19 and 21, the claimed limitations are system claims that are similar to method claims 3 and 8. Therefore, claims 19 and 20 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 20, Brown and Kurowski disclose the system of claim 18 wherein the authentication redirect generator is further configured to direct the client to access the requestg that is stored (see Brown, page 3, [0030]).

In respect to claim 24, Brown and Kurowski do not disclose wherein the application server and the authentication entity are implemented as one server. However, having a central server performing authentication and processing user request is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a central server for authentication and application purposes as a matter of design choices.

In respect to claim 28, the claimed limitation is similar to claim 14. Therefore, claim 28 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 29, the claimed limitation is similar to claim 20. therefore, claim 20 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (U.S. Patent Application Application (U.S. 2003/0061288 A1, hereinafter Brown) in view of Kurowski et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0019844, hereinafter Kurowski) and further in view of Polizzi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0023122).

In respect to claim 4, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 2. Brown and Kurowski do not disclose wherein the authentication token is a cookie stored by the client. However, Polizzi discloses cookies based authentication for web log in access (see Polizzi, page 10, [0074]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement cookie based authentication taught by Polizzi with Brown's authentication system and Kurowski's storing of persistent request for the benefit of authentication cookie cached in client's system while client is in session.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis-Jacques can be reached on (571) 272-3962. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/081,755
Art Unit: 2134

Page 10

January 20, 2007



KAMBIZ ZAND
PRIMARY EXAMINER